

REMARKS

Claims 33-55 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Section 101 Rejection:

The Office Action rejected claims 45-52 under 35 U.S.C. § 101. In light of the above amendments, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Section 112, Second Paragraph, Rejection:

The Office Action rejected claims 33-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. In light of the above amendments, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Section 103(a) Rejections:

The Office Action rejected claims 45 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warthen (U.S. Patent 6,584,464) in view of Machiraju, et al. (U.S. Patent 6,243,090) (hereinafter “Machiraju”), claims 53 and 54 as being unpatentable over Culliss (U.S. Patent 6,539,377) in view of Warthen, claims 46 and 47 as being unpatentable over Warthen and Machiraju in view of Suzuki, et al. (U.S. Patent 5,890,139) (hereinafter “Suzuki”), claims 49 and 50 as being unpatentable over Warthen and Machiraju in view of Warner (U.S. Patent 6,665,655), claims 33-35, 40, 44, 51 and 52 as being unpatentable over Culliss and Suzuki in view of Machiraju, claim 55 as being unpatentable over Warthen and Suzuki in view of Machiraju, claims 36-39 and 42 as being unpatentable over Culliss, Suzuki and Machiraju in view of Manduley, et al. (U.S. Patent 6,768,790) (hereinafter “Manduley”), claims 41 and 43 as being unpatentable over Culliss, Suzuki and Machiraju in view of Warthen.

In regard to claim 33, the cited art does not teach or suggest *receiving a question from a computer executed application, wherein the question pertains to the use of a particular website or particular information source of a content provider; in response to receiving the question, identifying an operational context for the question, wherein the operational context is associated with the question, and wherein the operational context comprises one or more of: a location within the particular website or particular information source, wherein the location is a current or recently visited location by a submitter of the question when the question is submitted; or information about a system from which the question is submitted; in response to identifying the operational context for the question, determining a category for the question, wherein the category is determined dependent upon the identified operational context.* The Office Action refers to Culliss, col. 3, lines 45-56, and col. 4, lines 30-59. However, the portions of Culliss cited in the Office Action pertain to inferring personal data for a user, not to identifying an operational context for a question. More particularly, at col. 3, lines 45-56, and col. 4, lines 30-59, Cullis describes classifying a user based on their search requests or article viewing habits. Culliss describes a user classification, not an operational context for a particular question. Note that the operational context recited in claim 33 is dependent on a location within the website or information source when the question is submitted, or dependent on information about a system from which the question is submitted. The classification in Culliss is for the user, not for a specific question. In other words, the classification in Culliss is not specific to a currently received question. Instead, the same user classification is used for all questions received from that user in Culliss. Nor do any of the other cited references, regardless of how combined, teach this aspect of claim 33. Similar arguments apply in regard to claims 44, 45, 51 and 53-55.

Further in regard to claim 33, the cited art does not teach or suggest *using a natural language indexing module to normalize both answered and unanswered questions, wherein one or more superfluous words are removed from the question to determine whether another question is substantially similar to the question; and store tracking data for the normalized answered and unanswered questions.* The cited references do not store tracking data for both normalized answered questions and

normalized unanswered questions. Suzuki determines whether or not an answer to the question is in the database. However, Suzuki does not normalize questions and does not store tracking data for both normalized answered questions and normalized unanswered questions. Machiraju determines matching questions, but does not storing tracking data for both normalized answered questions and normalized unanswered questions. Nor do any of the other cited references, regardless of how combined, teach this aspect of claim 33.

Further in regard to claim 45, the cited art does not teach or suggest *a statistics module adapted to return to the suggestion module a most frequently asked question for the category associated with the request based on frequency information for a plurality of questions; wherein the suggestion module is further adapted to respond to the request with the question and answer pair selected based upon the category from the context/category module and based on the frequency information as determined by the statistics module*. The Office Action refers to Warthen, col. 5, lines 15-25 and 45-56. However, no where does Warthen mention anything about its results being selected based upon both a category determined from a context of the question and based upon frequency information for a plurality of questions. Nor do any of the other cited references, regardless of how combined, teach this aspect of claim 45.

Further in regard to claim 51, the cited art does not teach or suggest *wherein for each of a plurality of requests, based on a request type of the request, the program logic is configured to select one of the question module, the suggestion module, or the authoring module to handle the request*. None of the references, whether considered alone or in combination, handle requests in the different ways recited in claim 51 based on the type of the request.

Further in regard to claim 51, the cited art does not teach or suggest *wherein the context/category module, knowledge module, statistics module, and tracking modules are each used by one or more of the question module, the suggestion module, or the authoring module in handling the requests*. None of the references, whether considered

alone or in combination, teach the particular combination of modules and the particular relationships between modules recited in claim 51.

Further in regard to claim 53, the cited art does not teach or suggest *identifying a plurality of most frequently asked questions associated with one or more of the plurality of categories associated with the context of the request for assistance*. The Office Action cites various portions of Warthen. However, Applicants can find no description in Warthen of identifying most frequently asked questions that are associated with the context of a particular request for assistance. Nor do any of the other cited references, regardless of how combined, teach this aspect of claim 53. Similar remarks apply in regard to claim 54.

Further in regard to claim 55, the cited art does not teach or suggest *identifying one or more frequently asked unanswered questions*. None of the cited references say anything about identifying frequently asked **unanswered** questions.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/6067-16203/RCK.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert C. Kowert/
Robert C. Kowert, Reg. #39,255
Attorney for Applicants

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: June 15, 2009